



**DEC 11 2001**

Oblon, Spivak, McClelland, Maier & Neustadt, P.C.  
Fourth Floor  
1755 Jefferson Davis Highway  
Arlington, VA 22202

In re Application of MEIER et al  
U.S. Application No.: 09/600,180  
Int. Application No.: PCT/EP99/00635  
Int. Filing Date: 01 February 1999  
Priority Date: 05 February 1998  
Attorney Docket No.: 194070US0 PCT  
For: DEVICE FOR PRODUCING POLYMER  
SUPPORT MATERIALS IN THE FORM OF  
POROUS POLYMER BEADS

**DECISION ON REQUEST**

**UNDER 37 CFR 1.497(d)**

This is in response to applicant's "Request for Reconsideration of Decision on Request Under 37 CFR 1.497(d)" filed 27 November 2001.

#### **BACKGROUND**

On 01 February 1999, applicants filed international application PCT/EP99/00635, which claimed priority of an earlier Germany application filed 05 February 1998. A copy of the international application was communicated to the USPTO from the International Bureau on 12 August 1999. A Demand for international preliminary examination, in which the United States was elected, was filed on 28 August 1999, prior to the expiration of nineteen months from the priority date. Accordingly, the thirty-month period for paying the basic national fee in the United States expired at midnight on 05 August 2000.

On 04 August 2000, applicants filed national stage papers in the United States. The submission was accompanied by, *inter alia*, the basic national fee required by 35 U.S.C. 371(c)(1).

On 22 August 2000, the United States Designated/Elected Office (DO/EO/US) mailed a Notification of Missing Requirements Under 35 U.S.C. 371 (Form PCT/DO/EO/905), indicating that an oath or declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.497 must be filed.

On 21 December 2000, applicants filed a request under 37 CFR 1.497(d) accompanied by an executed declaration and an assignment document. The declaration is executed by the inventors identified in the international application as well as one additional inventor, i.e. Thomas Boller.

On 05 March 2001, this Office mailed a decision dismissing the 21 December 2000 request on grounds that written consent of the assignee had not been provided.

On 30 March 2001, applicants filed a renewed request.

On 03 August 2001, this Office mailed a decision dismissing the 30 March 2001 renewed request on grounds that written consent of the assignee had not been established.

On 27 November 2001, applicants filed the present renewed request. A fee of \$400.00 for a two month extension of time will be charged to Deposit Account No. 15-0030 as authorized in the renewed request.

### DISCUSSION

37 CFR 1.497(d) (effective 07 November 2000) states,

If the oath or declaration filed pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 371(c)(4) and this section names an inventive entity different from the inventive entity set forth in the international application, the oath or declaration must be accompanied by: (1) a statement from each person being added as an inventor and from each person being deleted as an inventor that any error in inventorship in the international application occurred without deceptive intention on his or her part; (2) the processing fee set forth in § 1.17(i); and (3) if an assignment has been executed by any of the original named inventors, the written consent of the assignee (see § 3.73(b) of this chapter).

Applicants have previously satisfied items (1) and (2) above.

With regard to item (3) above, ownership of the application must be established when an assignee consents to a correction of inventorship. MPEP 324. Applicants have previously established a chain of title from the inventors to the assignee.

37 CFR 3.73(b) further provides that a submission establishing ownership must be signed by a party authorized to act on behalf of the assignee. MPEP 324 states,

The submission under 37 CFR 3.73(b) may be signed on behalf of the assignee in the following manner if the assignee is an organization (e.g., corporation, partnership, university, government agency, etc.):

(A) The submission may be signed by a person in the organization having apparent authority to sign on behalf of the organization. An officer (president, vice-president, secretary, or treasurer) is presumed to have authority to sign on behalf of the organization. The signature of the chairman of the board of directors is acceptable, but not the signature of an individual director. Modifications of these basic titles are acceptable, such as vice-president for sales, executive vice-president, assistant treasurer, vice-chairman of the board of directors. A person

having a title (manager, director, administrator, general counsel) that does not clearly set forth that person as an officer of the assignee is not presumed to have authority to sign the submission on behalf of the assignee. A power of attorney from the inventors in an organization to a practitioner to prosecute a patent application does not make the practitioner an official of an assignee or empower the practitioner to sign the submission on behalf of the assignee.

(B) The submission may be signed by any person, if the submission sets forth that the person signing is empowered to sign the submission on behalf of the assignee.

(C) The submission may be signed by a person empowered by an organizational resolution (e.g., corporate resolution, partnership resolution) to sign the submission on behalf of the assignee, if a copy of the resolution is, or was previously, submitted in the record.

Where a submission does not comply with (A), (B), or (C) above, evidence of the person's authority to sign will be required.

In the present case, item (B) applies. The "Consent for Assignee to Change of Inventorship" filed with the present renewed request states that the persons signing are empowered to sign the submission on behalf of the assignee.

Therefore, having established ownership of the application, the assignee has provided written consent to the change of inventorship.

### **CONCLUSION**

For the reasons above, the renewed request under 37 CFR 1.497(d) is **GRANTED**.

The application has an International Filing Date of 01 February 1999 and a date under 35 U.S.C. 371 of 21 December 2000.

The application will be forwarded to the DO/EO/US for processing in accordance with this decision.

  
Bryan Tung  
PCT Legal Examiner  
PCT Legal Office

Telephone: 703-308-6614  
Facsimile: 703-308-6459